



SVITLANA GRYTSENKO

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Ukraine
Kijevo nacionalinis Taraso Ševčenkos universitetas, Ukraina

KALBA KAIP KAUPIMO PRIEMONĖ IR KULTŪROS REPREZENTAVIMO FORMA

Language as an Accumulator
and a Form of Culture Representation

SUMMARY

This study analyses the dependency of language development on changes in the spiritual and material culture of the people which is in constant motion and self-affirmation. It also regulates social experience by carrying an echo of the past and forming the future worldview of its carrier. The study emphasizes that every national culture is developed according to the laws of diffusion and convergence. These laws allow the culture to share its achievements with other peoples and create spontaneously and independently of them. Language accumulates the achievements of different spheres of a people's culture in their complex and interconnected modes. The dependence of the dynamics of the lexicon on changes in material and spiritual culture is obvious. It may lead to the erroneous generalization that any changes in extralingual reality cause changes in language. However, the culture is not fully verbalized. There are small fragments of culture that are not nominated in language, i.e. part of the practical and intellectual heritage of the individual is represented outside the verbalization, because it has not become a collective experience or those fragments of collective experience have not become relevant to society.

The many details of extralinguistic reality accurately provide a basis for a linguistic analysis of the composition, semantic structure of language vocabulary. The markers of extralinguistic reality are the changes in cultural dominants.

SANTRAUKA

Straipsnyje nagrinėjama kalbos raidos priklausomybė nuo nuolatos judančios ir save teigiančios dvasinės bei materialinės kultūros pokyčių. Ši priklausomybė reguliuoja socialinę patirtį, neša praeities aidą ir formuoja kalbos skleidėjo būsimą pasaulėžiūrą. Pabrėžiama, kad kiekviena nacionalinė kultūra vystosi pagal išsibars-tymo ir suartėjimo dėsnius, kurie leidžia dalintis laimėjimais su kitomis tautomis arba kurti savarankiškai,

RAKTAŽODŽIAI: kultūrinė dominantė, kalbos dinamika, verbalizacija, kalbų kontaktai, skoliniai, kalba recipientė.

KEY WORDS: culture dominant, language dynamics, verbalization, language contacts, borrowings, recipient language.

nepriklausomai viena nuo kitos. Sudėtingais ir tarpusavyje susijusiais būdais kalba kaupia įvairių žmonių kultūros sferų laimėjimus. Kalbos žodyno dinamikos priklausomybė nuo materialinės ir dvasinės kultūros pokyčių – akivaizdi. Vis dėlto ji kartais veda prie klaidingo apibendrinimo, kad bet kokie ekstralingvistinės tikrovės pokyčiai skatina kalbos pokyčius. Tačiau kultūra ne visada verbalizuojasi. Yra nedideli kultūros fragmentai, kurie nėra įvardijami kalba, t. y. dalis praktinio ir intelektualinio individo paveldo išlieka neverbalizuota, nes tai kolektyvinė patirtis ar kolektyvinės patirties fragmentai, kurie nėra svarbūs visuomenei.

Tyrime pateikiamas išsamus, tikslus ir patikimas ekstralingvistinės tikrovės istorijos paveikslas atsižvelgiant į skirtingų diachroninių sekcijų pokyčius, nes kultūros dominančių pokyčiai yra ekstralingvistinės tikrovės žymekliai.

INTRODUCTION

The culture of mankind is created in the interaction of national cultures and really exists as their organic component. One of the world's national cultures is Ukrainian, which is manifested „in the worldview of Ukrainians, their national identity and temperament, the uniqueness of their understanding and vision of their existence, ideas about the meaning of life and purpose, ethical orientations, religious beliefs, legal norms and institutions, tastes and preferences, scientific and artistic achievements, in organically inherent in the people sensory and emotional perceptions, mythological and artistic images, logical concepts that are enshrined in the national language and other sign systems“ (Paton 2001: 8). Culture is in constant motion and self-affirmation. It regulates social experience, carries an echo of the past, and forms the worldview of its own carrier in the future (Korolyov, Domylivska 2020). Understanding and outlining the notion of culture has a long history:

- from the understanding of culture as the harmony of the system that man gives to nature (Cicero), his identification with civilization;
- interpretation of culture as a product

of „mind bearers“, i. e. educated people (Puffendorf);

- the emergence of the notion of national culture, which is determined by the existence of the ethnic group, nature, living conditions (J. Gerder);
- understanding of culture as the highest manifestation of nature and the apogee of its creative efforts (F. Schelling);
- outlining culture that has been identified with civilization as „a component of the whole that unites science, belief, art, law, morality, customs and all other abilities and skills acquired by man as a member of society“ (Tyler 1871: 1);
- awareness of culture as a social phenomenon, the formation and development of which is impossible outside society; „culture as a subsystem in the system of „society““ (Eshych 2000); depending on the approaches, culture is considered as „the sum of material and spiritual values“, „artificial nature“, „set of all human activities“, „spiritual state of society“, „set of sign systems“, „dynamic in time and space social subsystem of creation, storage, distribution and

dissemination of spiritual values, that shape and determine the intellectual and moral climate of society“, etc.;

- to anthropological conceptions that study culture in its historical-genetic, aesthetic and subject-material sides, outline internal historical-typological links with other cultures, accumulate attention on the most valuable national spiritual achievements (Grytsenko 2020; Vasko & oth. 2020). Culture is an integrative result of anthropogenesis, the specific sphere that was created by man during his formation. It reveals the universal position of man in the world, his attitude to the natural environment, to his own historical past and future (Kozlovskiy 1990: 3–7).

It should be noted that the diversity and originality of the phenomena of cultural life requires different approaches, which must inevitably change in the evolution of forms of social life and social consciousness, so we are aware that the notion of culture will undergo certain transformations over time.

Every national culture develops according to the laws of diffusion and convergence, which allows it to share its achievements with other peoples and create spontaneously, independently of them. Long-term and fruitful ties with the cultures of other countries were important for the development of Ukrai-

nian culture and its entry into the world context. I. Franko called on scholars to understand the unity of „their own, local, original, unique with imported, foreign, adopted from long-standing international relations“ (Franko 1983: 10).

Language accumulates the achievements of different spheres of people's culture in their complex and interconnected modes. As the basement of culture is a common human desire to transform the environment into a sphere of vital activity and means of human society development, we should admit that natural language, the primary function of which is the service of process of culture creation, could not exist.

The *object* of the study is foreign borrowings, attested in written monuments of the 16th–18th centuries, as representatives of the culture of peoples, which had an impact on the formation or adjustment of material and spiritual culture of Ukrainians.

The *subject* of the study is the development of the Ukrainian language lexicon of the 16th–18th centuries with reference to linguistic and cultural interethnic changes.

The purpose of the work is to outline the changes in the segments of the language and cultural picture of the world of Ukrainians, their cultural dominants through changes in the lexicon of the Ukrainian language of the 16th–18th centuries.

LANGUAGE IS AN IMPORTANT ELEMENT OF THE SPIRITUAL CULTURE OF THE PEOPLE

An important element of spiritual culture is language, which accumulates

knowledge and social experience. It is a means of exchanging information in all

spheres of human creativity, the only means of reflecting social consciousness in its entirety (Serebrennikov 1970: 420), which distinguishes it from other phenomena associated with verbalization, storage and transmission of information (Vyach. Ivanov). In the metaphorical definition of the connection between language and culture S. Lem emphasized the following: „Language for culture is the same as the central nervous system for man“ (Lem 1969: 49). Different views of scholars on the connection and relationship of language and culture can be traced: from the definition of language as a form of worldview and thinking of members of cultural and ethnic communities (M. Guboglo, I. Gorelov, A. Shakhnarovich); to the delineation of language as completely independent of culture, i.e. as a form of transmission of culture, as a means of its coding (E. Vereshchagin, V. Kostomarov); or to the assertion of the thesis that language forms are a subclass of a more general category, i.e. the category of cultural forms (F. Bock).

One time E. Sepir paid attention to the difficulty of issue of language influence on its contemporary culture:

„I cannot admit the real reasonable dependency between culture and language. The fact what society does and how it thinks defines culture. Language is a mode of thinking. It is hard to determine what particular reasonable dependencies between the selected experience (culture as value choice of society) and that special approach with the help of which the society expresses its different experience we can expect [...]. It is obvious that content of language cannot be separated from culture [...]. Language in its lexis more or less precisely reflects the culture which

it does not serve. The fact that history of language and history of culture develop in parallel is true“ (Sepir 1934: 171–172).

Complex dialectical relationships can be traced between language and culture: language as a verbal component of culture depends on culture, it reflects it with the help of the available arsenal of means, responds to changes in culture. At the same time, culture, especially elements of spiritual culture, correlates with forms of linguistic expression, being in complete dependence on them. O. Potebnya emphasized that language „is a means not to express a ready thought, but to create it“, „it is not a reflection of the worldview that has already developed, but the activity that makes it up“ (Potebnia 1913: 141). The ability of language to express more mobile and in much larger amounts of information than other forms of culture, to more effectively influence the formation of various aspects of culture forces to recognize the language status that is different from the status of other forms of culture. The Polish writer Ian Parandovsky emphasized in „Alchemy of the word“ that in words, grammatical shapes as well as syntaxes there is an image of this nation's soul; as traces in sands petrified from water of the seas, which disappeared long ago, it fixes wishes, preferences, hostility, faith, superstitions, and primary knowledge about the world and the human. Language is the first and reliable means of human socialization: for the „entry“ of the individual into society is insufficient to master only the „world of things“, the acquisition of material culture, i.e. on practice it is necessary to master the language. The defin-

ing place of language among the channels of sociocultural knowledge deals with to the fact that the personal experience of the individual is limited, compared with the socially valuable practice of the individual. This practical activity of the individual requires him / her to master the experience of generations and knowledge of the surrounding reality in huge quantities, which is several times greater than his / her individual experience. In addition, it is the language of all known sign systems and forms of culture that is able in a condensed, most economical form to encode, preserve and transmit a large amount of knowledge, which is the property of practical human activity (Gorelov, Shakhnarovich 1980: 124; Korolyov 2020). U. Vainraich emphasized that for many people language is both a symbol of faith and a holy. It should be noted that the list of elements of spiritual culture that is important for the life of an individual functions only in a verbalized form. All this confirms the idea of the „vertical“ nature of language as an element of culture in relation to other aspects of culture, the permeation of the language of other manifestations of ethnic culture.

The peculiarity of language as a means of verbalizing different aspects of culture and preserving in time information about past and present culture is the polychrony of language, i.e. the ability to combine and retain in the structure of language the results of social cognition, the results that are obtained in different synchronous sections. Polychronism does not mean the loss of linguistic elements of time marking; the imprint of time appears both in semantic connota-

tions, the nature of structures and in tangible changes in the frequency and areas of use of language units. Language stores a significant amount of diverse information not only about other elements of culture, the stages of their formation and development, but also about the history of language, i.e. about itself. The last aspect of the problem has long been in the centre of attention of linguists, especially comparative-historical linguistics.

The problem of the accumulation of culture by means of language is most closely connected with the elucidation of the laws of nomination and the historical variability or stability of language. The study of this problem should take place in the context of the edition of the connection between the history of language and the history of the ethnos (V. Abayev, G. Klepikova). The fixation in language of the changes taking place in society (in its practical and intellectual spheres) is a generally accepted fact. The dependence of the dynamics of the lexicon on changes in material and spiritual culture is so obvious that it provokes the erroneous generalization that any changes in extralinguistic reality cause changes in language, cf.: „Any changes that occur in life are reflected in vocabulary language composition [...]; elimination of old phenomena, old relations, concepts, objects, etc. leads to the displacement of the corresponding words from the vocabulary“ (Agaian 1960: 246). However, language practice shows that there is not so straightforward dependence, not so rigid determinism between changes in the repertoire of language units, their regrouping in

structures of different sizes and the dynamics of extralinguistic reality. The elements of culture can be synchronous with the corresponding means of verbalization, coexist with them in time. However, situations are typical when linguistic elements are correlated only with the images of the denotations they denoted (with reduced images); or for a long time there is no verbalization of the realities known and mastered by society. Therefore, culture is not fully verbalized: there are small fragments of culture, information about which is not preserved in language. There is no need to verbalize the whole set of information: there is a part of the practical and intellectual property of the individual outside the nomination that has not become a collective experience or those fragments of collective experience that have not become relevant to society.

The history of extralinguistic reality in many details, with a high degree of reliability and accuracy arises due to detailed linguistic analysis of the composition, semantic structure of language vocabulary taking into account changes in different synchronous sections, as markers of dynamics of extralinguistic reality, changes in cultural dominants of society are changes in lexicon (Grytsenko 2019). „The development of culture cannot but affect the development of language in general, but, above all, it is clearly reflected in its vocabulary“ (Kremlova 1992: 83). Various dictionaries as an alphabetically arranged reality is a valuable source of information about the history of culture, the peculiarities of understanding, development and nomination

of known realities, accumulate archaic elements in language, which, according to W. Humboldt, is a set of hieroglyphs in which man fits the world and his imagination (Humboldt 1985: 300).

The mechanism of accumulation of culture by language may be comprehended having imagined the results of this process, in particular, a manner and volume of the information which a language can preserve. A well-known linguistic postulate „a language reflects an extralingual reality“ loses its cogency when it comes to a concrete language material. The fact that we can conditionally „observe the synchronous projection of information“, which is familiar to a contemporary speaker or appears due to their participation, does not raise any objections of its actuality and meaning. But, when a researcher makes the vertical projection of information, namely, analyzing language facts reconstructs the data about the previous stages of development of speakers ‘material and spiritual culture’, then faces difficulties with the description of contradictive or negative hypotheses about the defined denotation. The analysis of different lexicographic sources convinces in existence of different versions about the information hidden in language units, which reach the previous stages of culture development.

The bright testimonies of the past are the names for nominating of correspondent realities and texts, which contain descriptions of realities and situations. We should not identify ‘brightness’ of these attests as completeness of information. Sometimes we have to observe the absence of a name of special reality

at the existence of descriptive information about it in memos. Derivatives from a name of special reality often serve as hypothetical testimonies of its existence in language. Language facts of distant epochs contribute in a cognizance of different cultures interaction. It should be noticed that ethnos-recipient adopts the elements of material culture faster and more active than words from foreign languages for their nomination. The processes of borrowing of reality and its name are not the simultaneous ones. These processes could have different socialization: approving of reality as useful, necessary, and new as well as denying its foreign name, which did not conform to typical structure of a language-recipient. So, as it was fixed by written sources, for a long time we can observe the opposing 'native-foreign' on the background of social, political, cultural and religious trends of different epochs.

Note that the obstacle for linguists is the fragmentation of information about the previous stages of culture development, the one that language preserved. This incompleteness of information is especially obvious in cases when necessary quantity of language elements for reconstruction of 'culture evolution' is absent. This reconstruction is impossible without an appropriate research of missed, 'shadowed' units of language, which is an important stage of updating the sides of culture hidden by time.

The methodological basis of the proposed study is theoretical provisions on: language as a repeater of cultural heritage of the people; language as a holistic system of elements; historical development of language; the ratio of statics and dynamics of speech; types of segmentation of the lexicosemantic system of language. The following *research methods* were used: descriptive, linguocultural, system-classification, statistical, etc.

REVISITING THE SIDES OF CULTURE HIDDEN BY TIME

The texts of written monuments, in particular of the 16th–18th centuries, allow the scholar to immerse himself / herself in the space of the culture of a distant time and to deeply comprehend the culture of the present.

A particularly valuable source of understanding the history of Ukrainian culture, and hence the language, is official business style memos of the second half of the 17th–18th centuries, which comprehensively represent the Ukrainian-speaking representative of society in historical, cultural and dialectological aspects. The significance of

these memos in the cultural heritage of the Ukrainian ethnos was highly valued by O. Levitsky: „It is unlikely that there will be other judicial acts that reflect the life of the people so vividly and fully as acts of Little Russia“ (Levitsky 1902: 6–7). The feature of Ukrainian written memos of official business style, which is a combination of language element and book official language in the established 'stencils' of the act language, made it possible to qualify them metaphorically as 'a kind of Ukrainian dialects textbook of the corresponding period'.

Authenticity of the transmission of the vernacular language, which accumulated the achievements of Ukrainian material and spiritual culture, is certified by the words of Gregory Podgaisky, a lokhvytsky clerk, who mentioned in 1665: „Мы, ура(д) Лофицки(й), чуючи у(ст)ную мову и ревеказию [...], записавъши до къни(г) декретовы(х) лофицки(х), записать казали“ (ЛРК: 136). The most valuable from the cultural point of view is the main part of the act documents, in which they represent the vernacular practice most vividly. They report about the essence of the case, reasons, motivation, circumstances, description of participants, their psychological state, and moral-ethic features, as well as actions, consequences and society attitude to the event.

Rich and genetically heterogeneous lexicon of official-style written memos, in particular „Лохвицької ратушної книги другої половини XVII ст.“, certifies the results of intercultural interaction of the period under study. Despite the natural saturation of act documents with Latin terms, which are integral elements of legal formulas, as well as specific and foreign lexemes, which nominate the concept of administrative management, these written sources record words and other genesis, which fully or partially represent elements of foreign culture mastered by Ukrainian society.

The borrowings preserved by memo touch all spheres of human life. They complement almost all thematic groups of vocabulary, contributing to the dynamics of the Ukrainian lexicon of the outlined period. In particular, among the names of weapons there is Turkism

чеканъ ‘a kind of an ancient weapon in the form of a stick with a hammer at the end’ (ЛРК: 66), Hungarian *шабля* ‘cold weapon (used by cavalry), saber’ (ЛРК: 83) and borrowing from the Czech language *ручница* ‘rifle, a kind of light, hand-held rifle’ (ЛРК: 123) are also attested among the names of weapons. Latinism *шкатула* / *шкатулка* ‘where valuables were kept’ (ЛРК: 103) is often mentioned in the acts among the names of furniture and interior elements. Note that the memos of the first half of the 18th century record a new borrowing – Polonism *пуделко* ‘box’ (Markovych 1895: 213), which certifies the dynamics of the Ukrainian language lexicon.

Among the foreign names of utensils and measures of capacity in the acts of the „Лохвицької ратушної книги другої половини XVII ст.“ there are certified borrowings: tur. *тазь* / *таць* ‘large shallow plate’ (ЛРК: 66), pol. *таця* / *таца* / *тация* ‘tray, platter’ (ЛРК: 60); pol. *шклянка* / *шклянниця* / *скленица* / *склянниця* ‘glass’ (ЛРК: 169) and preserved diminutive *шклянничка* (ЛРК: 168)). Note that borrowing *шклянка* was often used in the study period, it has not lost its relevance today, as evidenced by Ukrainian dialects that demonstrate the semantic dynamics of the lexeme, in particular in boiko dialects *склянка* denominates ‘decanter’ (Onyshkevych 1984: 223), in hutsul – *скленка* ‘bottle’ (ГТ: 171; Horbach 1997: 215), in Transcarpathian – *склянка* ‘half-liter bottle’ (Сабодош 2008: 333). The same thematic group of vocabulary also includes: pol. (< German) *пляша*, *флаша* ‘bottle’ (ЛРК: 49); the tightened form *куфъ* from germ. *кухоль* / *куфель* (ЛРК: 96); it. (or slat.) *барило*,

барилла 'convex barrel, a measure of liquid with a capacity of 90 l' (ЛПК: 123); pol. *цеберъ / цебра* 'large cylindrical container; tub, bucket; measure of capacity' (ЛПК: 45). Note that sometimes the German source of borrowing *цеберъ* (Zober) (Sedláček 1923: 95) as well as its connection with the Lithuanian form *kibti* 'to hang', *kibėti* 'to move' (Brückner 1957: 56) is indicated.

Some borrowings as a consequence of polysemantization contributed to the development of various thematic groups of vocabulary and lexico-semantic groups, in particular, the Latinism *кварта* meant 'the measure of the capacity of liquid and bulk substances', 'tax on the fourth part of the income of the royal lands for the maintenance of the army, the quartz army', 'mug with a capacity of a quart'. Thus, one borrowing contributed to the development of the following thematic groups of vocabulary: metrology (names of units and weights), trade nomenclature and economic vocabulary (names of money taxes and duties), names of household items (names of utensils).

Among the names of lighting in the acts of „Лохвицької ратушної книги другої половини XVII ст.” the Latinism of Greek origin *лампа* 'lamp, candle, lamp, torch' („лямпу сребную ... завесивъши” (ЛПК: 26) is certified. Note that this borrowing denotes an object with the outlined signs 'shine, illuminate'. According to written sources, as a result of semantic attraction, the analyzed lexeme began to nominate other objects that generate light, in particular 'star, luminary, constellation Pleiades'. In various genres of written memos, we

can trace the semantic dynamics of the lexeme *лампа*, in particular, transfer the meaning 'shine' into:

- intellectual activity: 'the luminary – bearer of truth, goodness, education';
- moral and ethical features: 'manifestation of God's grace, light, radiance'; 'virtue, honesty'; 'thirst, passion'.

Acts of the „Лохвицької ратушної книги другої половини XVII ст.” certified borrowings to denote utility and residential premises, in particular the Germanism *шона* nominated 'barn' (ЛПК: 78); Russian borrowing (< German) *кабак* meant 'the room for dwelling' (ib.). The studied memo often records the Latinism of the Greek origin *комора* which first appeared in written sources in the 14th century to denote the 'state treasury', and later, in written sources of the 15th century it is attested with the sema 'warehouse house, shop'. Later sources demonstrate the affiliation of semantic amplitude, its various manifestations within the seam. If the memos record the formation of individual meanings, close to the core of the sema ('room' → 'institution located in this room'), then the semantic structure is aligned according to the contours of the semantic core. Semas certify the constancy of the semantic core of this lexeme during the 16th-18th centuries:

- 'utility room for food, household items' („солонины штукъ деве(т) с комори покрали” (ЛПК: 123);
- 'room' („Клетъ: Комора, кувната” (ЛБ: 53));
- 'premises for renting a dwelling, an apartment' („а на(и)мовали бы в доме(х) свои(х) коморы имели шинкъ або пожито(к) яки(и)” (ВЛС: 46);

combination certified in memos *коморою жити*, which meant 'dwell' (ОВЛЗ: 198));

- 'customs' („шли ... на комору Львовскую, и мыто тежь Корунное заплатили“ (РЕА, I: 210));
- 'shop' („коморы на мести съ крамами“ (РЕА, II: 131)).

A system of meanings was used to convey additional meanings; the borrowed lexeme became an element of a multicomponent nominative structure, which denoted the concept of Ukrainian realities of the period under study: *болницкое коморы* 'hospital'; *комора мытная* 'customs' / *мытницкая* / *мытничая*; *комора крамъная* 'shop' / *комора торговая*; *комора пострыгальная* 'hairdresser's'; also, formal derivatives were recorded: *коморка потребная* 'toilet'; *комо(р)ка куха(р)скаа* 'kitchen'.

In many acts of the „Лохвицької ратушної книги другої половини XVII ст.“ the establishment where intoxicating drinks were made and sold was mentioned and marked by the Arabism *корчма*. This borrowing was first attested in the old Ukrainian memo of the 14th century („Ана продала петрашкови ... свою дѣднину ... и съ коръчмою и землею“ 1359 (Rozov 1928: 10)), and in the sources of the later period it became widespread, retaining its meaning; „галасы чинишь и люде(й) с ко(р)чъми ро(з)ганяешъ?“ 1656 (ЛРК: 82)). In written memos such establishment was sometimes called as a descriptive structure, which included Church Slavicism and Arabism: *изба коръчомъная* 1552 (ОКан.3.: 19). Note that written sources attested the Arabism *корчма* to the designation of 'intoxicating drink'. For the

first time this borrowing with such meaning is fixed by a memo „Паисиевскій сборникъ конца XIV или начала XV в.“ (Срезн. I: 1413); it is also recorded in the sources of the 15th century (ССУМ: 501) and the 16th century having stored its meaning (АЮЗР, II: 117).

Note that in the 16th-18th centuries new designations of premises for the trade of intoxicating drinks and their production appear: germ. *шинкѣ* (1525) / *шинокѣ* (1534) and word combination *домъ шинковный* (1710), *арендовый шинкѣ* (1691).

The dynamics of the Ukrainian lexicon was due to the importance of processing grain into vodka for the Ukrainian economy, as this industry was extremely profitable. The lands of Ukraine were practically „dotted“ with taverns and inns. According to I. Kamanin, in 1789 only in one city Zhytomyr for every 7 houses or 24 people there was one tavern or inn. On the Right Bank of Ukraine there was a right of propination, which was realized through rent. Not everyone could trade intoxicating drinks, this exclusive right was often defended in the court: „жа(д)ною мерою та(к) казакови, яко и мещанину гори(л)кою ши(н)кова(т), кро(м) аре(н)ды, не волно“ 1657 (ЛРК: 86). According to M. Tyshchenko, the Cossacks and the sergeant had the right to smoke vodka, but they had to sell it to tenants in bulk. All public life was concentrated in these establishments, where people could relax, socialize, taste the food and drinks sold on credit. Debt collection took place once a quarter or six months in the presence of the Voight and the jury. Bartenders and innkeepers in the pursuit of profit

resorted to fraud. The Central State Historical Archive of Ukraine preserved a document (ф. 51, оп. 3, спр. 8434, арк. 2) on the inspection of taverns, arranged by the Nizhyn magistrate in 1742, during which it was found out that in many taverns „кварти явились з двома днами, другие воском поналивані, протчие очень малие, а все тые квартиры против мерной ведерковой городской квартиры весьма обманные, и меньшие“. There is also written evidence of the dishonesty of innkeepers in relation to customers, in particular the National Library of Ukraine named after V. Vernadsky preserved a document of 1684 (п-14026, арк. 115) about how „челядки ... признают, що прави кождое ночи по килка ведер приносили воду в горилку ... и сам он, Михайло, веселий, признался ..., що в єдну куфу пять ведер води всипав“. Written sources of the second half of the 17th–18th centuries often emphasize the damage to the public morals and public peace of pubs, as their customers staged fights, organized ‘подпилим способом’ as well as robberies and thefts, violence and murders.

Fairs were a unique phenomenon in Ukrainian culture, which locally covered both Right-Bank and Left-Bank Ukraine and consolidated Ukrainian society, as well as stimulated the diversity of its development and mutual exchange of material and spiritual culture. In the vast majority of Ukrainian cities fairs were timed to religious holidays, but on the holiday itself trade was prohibited. The frequency of fairs was determined by special privileges. As a rule, one to four fairs took place annually, but there is evidence that, according to a special

privilege, ten fairs were held annually in Yasnohorodka near Zhytomyr, and twelve fairs in Kochorov near Radomyshl. The economic role of fair trade was recognized by the government and fully supported, as evidenced by the privilege granted to the city of Korostyshiv (1771): „Бажаючи у якнайліпшому щасті, оздобах і достатках бачити королівство, довірене нам від бога, дуже хочемо, щоб усі міста й містечка через торгівлю і ярмарки до найліпшого прийшли становища з користю для всіх мешканців і держави“ (АрхЮЗР, Ч. V, т. 1: 423). Fairs were a real celebration of trade, where there was excitement, an atmosphere of joy from the sold or purchased goods, making deals, and meeting friends and new acquaintances.

During the period under study, almost all collections of act documents record the German borrowing of Latin origin *ярмарокъ*, which entered the Ukrainian language through Polish, in which it has been active since the 15th century: *jormark* (1408), *jarmark* (1500), *jermak* (15th c.). This borrowing is also attested in „Лохвицькій ратушній книзі другої половини XVII ст.“, which deals with illegal actions that took place at or after the fair, mainly:

- theft of cattle („въ купъцовъ кони по(д) ча(с) я(р)маръку ... силою бра(т)“ (ЛРК: 23)), property („зе(й) шло(м) я(р)ма(р)це ло(х)ви(ц) ко(м) ... па(н) О(с)тапъ, будучи по(д)пилы(м), поя(с) з нужьнами сребными Супрунь, обывате(л) иче(н)ски(й), зня(въ)ши, да(л) Яцисе до (с)хованя“ (ЛРК: 66)) or money („по(д) ча(с) я(р)маръку в ко(р)чме

по(д)пили(й) Васи(д) и Ра(д)ко ... гроши в его выняти, якобы бѹчи его“ (ЛПК: 63));

- fights („по зе(ц)шломъ лофи(ц)комъ я(р)марѹку межѹ цигани звада стала“ (ЛПК: 39)) or redistribution of spheres of criminal influence („в справе, што по зе(и)шло(м) лохви(ц)ко(м) я(р)марѹку ... цигане сторона на сторону межѹ собою забо(й)ство вѣдали“ (ЛПК: 26)).

This borrowing became widespread in the recipient language, as evidenced not only by the frequency of fixations in written sources of the period under study, but also active use of derivatives by speakers, in particular: „ме(ш)корез я(р)маро(ч)ный“ (ЛПК: 62), „по(д) часть

я(р)маркови(и)“ (ЛПК: 45), „о (г)роша(х) Ярѹма(ш)ковы(х)“ (ЛПК: 79).

The government's desire to ensure an adequate level of legal protection for visitors of fairs led to the introduction of fair courts, which according to the reform of 1763 were defined as bodies endowed with special judicial functions.

The research of written memos has shown that in order to understand the peculiarities of the mentality of that time human as a representative of a particular social, ethnic, religious, territorial and professional class, it is necessary to take into account some factors. They are knowledge of not only factual nature, but also the results of research of historical disciplines, which represent the general philosophical understanding of the epoch.

CONCLUSIONS

The lexicon of any epoch clearly outlines sociocultural dominants (e.g., spheres of production, classes of objects of material culture in terms of relevance for society, etc.), and, in comparison with the previous stages of language, allows us to trace the dynamics of such dominants. Thus, there are concepts: „man as a bearer of external signs, ~ emotional states, ~ the subject of mental activity“, „human environment“, „possession, property, world of things“, „objects of human possession / society“, „law“, „protection, war“, „faith and its manifestations, external attributes“, „knowledge of the world“ among the constants of the conceptsphere of Ukrainian society of the XVI–XVIII centuries by the number of elements and the frequency of use of the correspond-

ing nominative units in the texts of monuments. The dynamics of the lexicon, i.e. the saturation or reduction of lexical groups of the respective ideographic spheres, is largely a reflection of the dynamics of the conceptspheres – the understanding and profiling of the known world.

Language, being one of the important components of culture, is also a form of verbalization of various aspects of culture: from everyday practical experience to the achievements of spiritual culture. It is materialized in various forms and represented in written and scientific sources, the culture of the previous stages of the life of the ethnos is the basis for its further improvement and study. The preservation in writing of linguistic archaisms, associated with denotated for

this stage of development of society denotations, opens the possibility of returning such elements of language to life. With the help of language there is a re-

production in the memory of the people of many aspects of past life, collective experience, which is the basis for further development of national culture.

References

- Agaian, Eduard. 1960 – Агаян, Эдуард. 1960. *Введение в языкознание* [Introduction into linguistic]. Ереван: Изд-во Ереван. ун-та.
- Brückner, Aleksander. 1957. *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Warszawa: Wiedza Powszechna.
- Vasko R., Korolyova A., Pakholok Z., Korolyov I. 2020. Logic and Semiotic Passportization Data of Numbers in Different Cultures. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research* 9(3): 277–287.
- Gorelov Ignat, Shakhnarovich Aleksandr. 1980 – Горелов Игнат, Шахнарович Александр. 1980. *Культура, язык и социализация личности* [Culture, language and socialization of a person.]. In *Взаимодействие развития национальных языков и национальных культур* [Interaction of developments of national languages and national cultures]. Москва: Наука: 119–127.
- Grytsenko, Svitlana. 2019. Dynamics as an Immanent Language Sing, *Logos* 99: 189–199.
- Grytsenko, Svitlana. 2020. Lituansisms in Ukrainian as Markers of Language and Cultural Relationship, *Logos* 102: 77–89.
- Horbach, Oleksa. 1997 – Горбач, Олекса. 1997. Південно-буковинська гуцульська говірка с. Бродина, пов. Радівці Румунія [South Bukovinian Hutsul dialect with. Brodina, pov. Radovci Romania], *Зібрані статті. VIII. Історія мови. Діалектологія. Лексикологія (Фотопердрук)* [Collected articles. VIII. History of language. Dialectology. Lexicology (Photo reprint)]. Мюнхен. Вип. 12. Т. 8: 135–238.
- Humboldt, Wilhelm fon. 1985 – Гумбольдт, Вильгельм фон. 1985. *Язык и философия культуры* [Language and philosophy of a culture]. Москва: Прогресс.
- Paton, Borys Y. (Ed.). 2001 – Патон, Борис С. (Гол. ред.). 2001. *Історія української культури: у 5-ти т.* [History of Ukrainian culture. In 5 vol.]. Київ: Наукова думка. Т. 2.
- Kozlovskiy, Viktor. 1990 – Козловский Виктор. 1990. *Культурный смысл: генезис и функции* [Sense of culture: genesis and functions]. Київ: Наукова думка.
- Korolyov, Igor. 2020. Discursive Practices as Sign Constructs of Communicative Consciousness, *Logos* 102: 61–69.
- Korolyov Igor, Domylyvska Ludmyla. 2020. Mentality and National Character as Semiotic Regulators of Communicative Behavior, *Journal of History Culture and Art Research* 9(1): 354–364.
- Kremlova, Olena. 1992. – Кремльова, Олена. 1992. До питання про особливості функціонування мовних одиниць з національно-культурним компонентом у художньому тексті [To the issue of particularities of functioning of language units with national culture component in art text], *Лінгвістичні дослідження* 2: 83–86.
- Eshych, Momchilo B. (Ed.) 2000 – Ешич, Момчило Б. (Отв. ред.). 2000. *Язык как средство трансляции культуры* [Language as a means of transmitting culture]. Москва: Наука.
- Levitsky, Orest. 1902 – Левицкий, Орест. 1902. *Очерки народной жизни в Малороссии во второй половине XVII ст.* [Essays of people life in Malorossia second half of XVII ct.]. Київ: Тип. Императ. ун-та св. Владимира.
- Lem, Stanislav. 1969 – Лем, Станислав. 1969. Модель культуры [Model of culture], *Вопросы философии* [Philosophical issues] 8: 49–62.
- Markovych, Yakiv A. 1895 – Маркович, Яків А. 1895. *Дневник генерального подскарбья Якова Марковича (1717–1767 гг.)* [Diary of General Podskarbiy Yakov Markovich (1717–1767)]. Киев: Киевская Старина. Ч. 2.
- Onyshkevych, Mykhailo Y. 1984 – Онишкевич, Михайло Й. 1984. *Словник бойківських говірок: у 2 ч.* [Dictionary of Boyko's dialects]. Київ: Наукова думка. Ч. 2.
- Serebrennikov, Boris A. (Ed.). 1970 – Серебренников, Борис А. (Ред.). 1970. *Общее языкознание: Формы существования, функции, история языка* [General linguistics: forms of existence, functions and history of language.]. Москва: Наука.
- Potebnia, Aleksandr. 1913 – Потенбня, Александр. 1913. *Мысль и язык* [Thought and language]. Харьков: Типография Мирный труд.

- Rozov, Volodymyr. 1928 – Розов, Володимир. 1928. *Українські грамоти* [Ukrainian charters]. Київ: друк. ВУАН. Т. 1.
- Sabadosh, Ivan. 2008 – Сабадош, Іван. 2008. *Словник закарпатської говірки села Сокирниця Хустського району: понад 15900 діалектних слів* [Dictionary of Transcarpathian dialect of Sokirnitsia village in Khust district: more than 15900 dialect words]. Ужгород: Ліра.
- Serip, Edward. 1934 – Сепир Эдвард. 1934. *Язык* [Language]. Москва; Ленинград: Гос. соц.-экон. изд-во.
- Sedláček, August. 1923. *Paměti a doklady o staročeských mirách a vahách*. Praha: Česká akademie.
- Tyler, Edward. 1871. *Primitive Culture. Researches Into the Development of Mythology, Philosophy, Religion, Art, and Custom*. London: John Murray.
- Franko, Ivan 1983– Франко, Іван. 1983. *Зібрання творів: у 50-ти т.* [Collection of writings. In 50 vol.]. Київ: Наукова думка. Т. 40.

Abbreviation

- АрхЮЗР – Архив Юго-Западной России, издаваемый Временною комиссиею для разбора древних актов... Киев: в тип. Федорова, 1859–1911. Ч. 5. №1.
- АЮЗР – Акты, относящиеся к истории южной и западной России, собранные и изданные археографическою комиссиею. Санкт-Петербург: тип. Праца, 1863-1892.
- ВЛС – Артикули або закони Великого князівства Литовського (2-й Литовський статут Почаївського або Волинського списку, 1566) // ЛНБ ім. В. Стефаніка, Від. рукоп. Шифр О/Н–15. Л. 38.
- ГГ – Гуцульські говірки: короткий словник. Львів: Львів. обл. кн. друк., 1997.
- ЛБ – Лексикон словенороский Памви Беринди. Київ: Вид-во АН УРСР, 1961.
- ЛРК – Лохвицька ратушна книга другої половини XVII ст. Київ: Наук. думка, 1986.
- ОВЛЗ – Опис Володимирського замку (Володимир, 1552): рукопис, РГАДА. Ф. 389. (Литовська метрика). Од. зб. 563. Арк. 191 зв. – 202 зв.
- ОКан.З. – Опис Канівського замку. (Канів, 1552): рукопис, РГАДА. Ф. 389. (Литовська метрика). Од. зб. 563. Арк. 18 зв. – 32 зв.
- РЕА – Русско-еврейский архив: документы и материалы для истории евреев в России. – Санкт-Петербург: Общество распротр. просвещ. между евреями в России. Т. 1–2, 1882.
- ССУМ – Словник староукраїнської мови XIV–XV ст. Київ : Наукова думка, 1977. Т. 1.
- Срезн. – Матеріали для Словаря древнерусскаго языка по письменнымъ памятникамъ / трудъ И. И. Срезневскаго. Санкт-Петербург: тип. Имп. акад. наукъ, 1893–1912. Т. 1–3.